

#C_o_S_1 (Semi-Axiomatic) The creator exists, so does magic, we call him SMILEY_LOVE

#CoS_1_0: There is a creator (Semi-axiomatic)

There is a god, well at least there is a creator. We (semi) establish its existence thus. The simple truth is that while the existence of a creator remains axiomatic (meaning postulated and not observed), we at least observe the creation so we recursively reach for the creator. We cannot, through reason alone, understand the creation out of nothing. We cannot comprehend that nothing would give something. We need something to give something, as we cannot imagine creation ab initio. There must be a primal cause, at least from the deductive causal point of view. That nothing would beget something, is enough to postulate 'the creator' as the original magician. So we have to (semi) postulate 'the creation' for we observe it and are part of it. WE EXIST. Existence comes from a CREATOR. We call him SMILEY-LOVE for we might as well postulate it's benign intent towards our existence. Otherwise why create the universe in the first place?

#CoS_1_1: There is magic (deductive)

That nothing begets something is a philosophical dead end, then. Or is it? If anything it forces us to admit that at some layer of reality MAGIC exists, call it the original act of creation, the something out of nothing, the 1 out of 0. The existence of the original act of universe creation itself force us must admit the existence and dominion of magic at a certain layer of reality. As far as we are concerned, when dealing with creation, the act itself is magic and will remain understood as so. No amount of 'technology' will mimic the act of creation. There is magic at the doors of the realm of creation, for everything else we have technology and science.

THE CHURCH OF SPACE

#CoS_1_2: I think therefore I am?

Descartes 'cogito' was a sleight of mind, "I think therefore I am" is really, on careful consideration, a tautological statement. The tautology of "I am therefore I am". It is the declaration of thinking the act of thought, which substitute here for the declaration of being of ego. Thought, here, is the thing we declare in existence. He observe the existence of act of thought and deduce an operator, the ego. The Descartes cogito deals more with the proof of existence of an "I", an ego, as it too postulates "existence" by stating the existence of thought, or rather the wilful act of thought. But it does not speak to the mystery of existence itself beyond the axiomatic declaration of existence of thought, its tautology. The logical conclusion is around the "I" and can be parsed as "Something exists (thought) and _I_ derives from it as the creator of the thought". It establishes the existence of ego (the I) once creation happened. It also establishes there are at least two entities in existence: you and SMILEY-LOVE. Descartes corollary reads "I am therefore It is" (the creator).

#CoS_1_3: To be or not to be? THAT is the question.

Shakespeare's 'be or not be' deals more honestly with the question of existence, not just in the ego sense as the verb "be" can be applied to the ego, but rather the existence of the universe itself. The very fact that it exist being the unsolvable riddle. But if anything exists (even the illusion of existence as a thought), then something created it. We cannot fathom something coming out of nothing, creation ab initio is not a philosophical category that makes sense to rational thought, so at some point you have magic again.

THE CHURCH OF SPACE

#CoS_1_4: Incompleteness theorem.

Since Goedel's proof, we know that our representation of nature and the universe (science) is necessarily incomplete from a strict logical philosophy standpoint. Any symbolic philosophical system will contain statements that are unprovable ("this is a false statement" being a typical example). Unprovable statements will exist within the framework. The nature of the act of creation may be one such statement outside of every philosophical system we can devise. Not just nonsensical ones but also those that inquire about the nature of the act of creation itself and most specifically the actor if that makes any sense. The ORIGINAL ACT OF CREATION will remain magic, out of our reach for ever. Neither Science nor Religion can nor will EXPLAIN the act of creation, both will wonder at it and in the case of science, will study it with methods and science.

#CoS_1_5: SCIENCE and technology are the natural philosophy.

Science, and most particularly its child Technology, represents the modern, natural, perennial, philosophy. What seemed so magical as teleportation and telepathy, today are known in every day technology as 'airplane' and "cell-phone". We will expose a new religion in the midst of science, one that looks a lot like the old ones in its existence of aether and aether constructs. For example one can find simple analogs of the existence of Hell, upon learning Quantum Mechanics, in the fact that our birth star goes red giant when it runs out of fuel in 4B years. There will be flames. Here. As deriving from the observation of nature, we can share its methods and results amongst humans without slaughtering each other, unlike other philosophical systems including religious and political.

THE CHURCH OF SPACE

#CoS_1_6: For everything else there is silence.

To paraphrase Wittgenstein's "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." We cannot understand behind the veil of magic. The act of creation so clearly demonstrates the existence of a magic beyond any reasonable doubt for the philosophically inclined. That magic will remain outside our reach and comprehension. We will call our creator SMILEY-LOVE and pass in silence on its ontologies.



THE CHURCH OF SPACE